REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as presently amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-20 stand rejected.

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the personal interview conducted on October 23, 2008. During the course of the interview, the rejection under §103 was discussed, emphasizing that none of the Tsuboi et al. and Teradaira references disclose the claimed "wherein ….said parent device has a means for issuing a one-time measured value save command to said plural measurement electronic device units including the own unit…to thereby cause said plural measurement electronic device units to simultaneously store in the respective memories the current values being measured by the respective detectors at the time of issuance of the one-time measured value save command." As a result of the discussion during the interview, Applicants agreed to add the underlined changes shown above to claim 1 to clarify the invention. The Examiner agreed that claim 1 with the changes shown above distinguishes over the combination of references currently applied against the claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuboi et al. (USP 6,263,380, previously cited) in view of Teradaira (USP 6,516,440, previously cited). For the reasons set forth in detail below, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially, as noted above, independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify the storing of measured values by the plural measurement electronic device units. More particularly, claim 1 was amended to recite that the plural measurement electronic device units "simultaneously store in the respective memories the <u>current</u> values <u>being</u> measured by the respective detectors at the time of issuance of the one-time measured value save command."

As discussed during the interview, the Office Action acknowledges that the **Tsuboi** reference does not disclose the features related to simultaneously storing in the respective memories the current values being measured by the respective detectors of the plurality of measurement electronic device units. The **Teradaira** reference is relied on to teach "said plural measurement electronic device units ...simultaneously store in the respective memories the values measured by the respective detectors at the time of issuance of the one-time measured value save command."

In particular, based on the comments in the paragraph bridging pages 10 and 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner considers the copying of data from the RAM 3 to the EEPROM 5 in response to various trigger events, as taught by **Teradaira**, to correspond to the following:

> "issuing a one-time measured value save command, in response to a request from the external device, to thereby cause a plurality of data to simultaneously store in the respective memories the respective data at the time of issuance of the one-time measured value save command." See page 11, lines 8-11 of the Office Action.

However, it is respectfully submitted that **Teradaira** does not disclose or suggest "wherein ....said parent device has a means for issuing a one-time measured value save

- 11 -

command to said plural measurement electronic device units including the own unit...to thereby

cause said plural measurement electronic device units to simultaneously store in the respective

memories the <u>current</u> values <u>being</u> measured by the respective detectors at the time of issuance of

the one-time measured value save command," as presently recited in claim 1.

Teradaira discloses that various sensors (measurement units) monitor the operating

condition of the printer, and that the sensor data is stored directly in a RAM 3. Further,

Teradaira discloses that the "The printer status data in RAM 3, which is generated in response

to the operating conditions detected by the sensors, is *sequentially* updated...." [Emphasis

added]. See col. 7, lines 7-11. At some time after the sensor data has been stored in RAM 3, a

trigger event in **Teradaira** causes *previously* measured values that have been stored in the RAM

3 to be transferred to EEPROM 5 for more permanent storage (that is, the RAM 3 is a volatile

memory, whereas the EEPROM 5 is a non-volatile memory).

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that, unlike the claimed invention, **Teradaira** does not

disclose or suggest that a one-time measured value save command causes the respective detectors

(i.e., the sensors) to *simultaneously store current values being measured by the respective*

detectors at the time of issuance of the one-time measured value save command.

In contrast, **Teradaira** discloses that the values currently being measured by the sensors

(detectors) are *sequentially* stored in RAM 3. Further, **Teradaira** is completely silent regarding

simultaneously storing the values currently *being* measured by sensors at the time the trigger

event is issued. Unlike the claimed invention, the trigger event in **Teradaira** causes *previously*

measured values that have first been sequentially stored in the RAM 3 to then be transferred to the EEPROM 5 at a later time defined by the trigger event.

Further, it is noted that in the *Response to Arguments*, the Examiner asserts "it would have been obvious…to modify **Tsuboi** to include the teachings of **Teradaira** because data gathered from a specific sensor and stored simultaneously would have allowed … ." However, as discussed above, **Teradaira** does not disclose or suggest simultaneously storing current values being measured by respective sensors. **Teradaira** discloses *sequentially* (i.e., one after the other) storing sensor data in a (volatile) RAM and then, at a later time in response to a trigger, transferring the (non-currently being measured) data stored in the RAM to a non-volatile EEPROM for more permanent storage.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that **Teradaira** does not alleviate the deficiencies of **Tsuboi**, and the combination of references does not result in the claimed invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under §103 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection and an indication of allowability of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that there are issues remaining to be resolved in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite and complete prosecution of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

<div align="center">

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

William M. Schertler
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 35,348
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

</div>

WMS/dlt